

them to make a living. So they have destroyed jobs. They killed the bridge to the future because they killed our bill to reorganize trade.

I worked with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER], a hero of this Congress, and others who tried to bring some business sense to our international trade effort, and they have destroyed that bridge. Maybe Mr. Canter is smiling today, because he helped destroy a bridge to the future, a bridge to good-paying jobs, a bridge to increase the median income of the average American. That median income has gone down. That is why Americans have less in their pockets today, because taxes went up, because this Congress will not address the problem of overregulation. One hundred thirty-two thousand Federal employees do nothing but regulate, so we take those jobs out of New York, Pennsylvania, California, Florida, and we send them across the border.

Finally, litigation. This administration vetoed litigation reform. When you sue everybody, what do you do? You send business and industry and good-paying jobs out of this country, so they have destroyed the bridge to the future for my children, for your children. They have relegated us to \$5.15 an hour jobs. In my State, for not working, on welfare you get the equivalent of \$8.75 for not working, and you get health coverage. So why work? You have to be dumb to work at \$5.15, which they are promoting.

I urge my colleagues to look at this. Let us build bridges to the future, not destroy them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SCARBOROUGH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. TALENT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

ENVIRONMENTAL ARROGANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I chair the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Lands. In the early 1970's, Congress passed a law called the National Environmental Protection Act, and in 1976, the FLPMA Act on other areas that would take care of the public lands. We determined there that anything that happened on public lands, that the public would have some input on it. They would have the opportunity to have hearings; anybody,

they would have the opportunity to challenge what the Government did, so it would be adequately done without some high-handed individual coming along and shoving something down the throat of the population.

That was probably a pretty good piece of legislation. I mentioned, I chair the subcommittee, and every time we have a bill, and, Mr. Speaker, we have probably had more hearings than any other subcommittee on the Hill, the administration comes up. Here comes the BLM, here comes the Forest Service, here comes in Department of Reclamation. They say, "Mr. Chairman, there has to be more public input on this bill. We have to have more time for the public to have due process on this bill. You have got to be here and listen to these things."

I agree with most of that. People should have input. In the little State of Utah that I represent, as two other Members represent, we have some beautiful areas. We have six national monuments and a number of national parks. We have Arches, Canyonlands, Bryce, Zion, a piece of the Grand Canyon; we have some beautiful areas. Out of that, it seems like my friends from the East always want to come out and tell us how to determine our own lives.

Surprisingly enough, yesterday the President of the United States stood on the south rim of the Grand Canyon and announced a national monument in Utah of 2 million acres, 2 million acres. That is the size of Delaware. That is the size of Yellowstone National Park.

Lo and behold, guess who he told about it? Absolutely no one. The Governor of the State was not made aware, the two Senators were not made aware, the Members of the House, including of his own party, were not made aware. The President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, the legislature, and the county commissioners, nobody was told except President Clinton decided he wanted to do it.

This particular area has the largest coal reserve there is in the history, anywhere we can find in America. There is enough coal in the ground for the energy of Utah for 1,000 years, low-sulfur coal, which can be mined environmentally sound. In this area happens to be 10 cities; the first time that I know of that 10 cities now find themselves in a national park with the stroke of a pen.

How did he get the right to use that pen? He got the right because of the antiquated Antiquities Act of 1906, which said the President could preserve and protect Indian ruins. That was the theory behind it, Indian ruins; not saying you could go create things bigger than about every park, bigger than a lot of States. No, that was not the idea.

But the extreme environmental community, who wants to kill our timber, wants to kill our mining, wants to keep people from going into the wilderness and enjoying it and fishing, hunting, standing there and looking at God's beauty, no, we do not get to do that, because the President of the United States, in his great, wonderful,

awesome wisdom, greater than anybody, he had the right to say this beautiful area should be reserved.

Let me ask something, has the President been there? Has the President seen it? No, the President does not even know where it is. He could not come within 500 miles of it if you put a map down in front of him. That does stop him from coming in and signing the Antiquities law and saying, let us take care of this. Does that smack anybody of being political, considering that the environmental community is putting millions of dollars in this reelection? Does that smack anybody of that at all? Why did he not just wait? Why did he not wait until after, sitting down as we have down with every other park and national monument in the history of the State, in the history of the United States, and say, let us work this out?

No, I have never, in 26 years as an elected official, as past Speaker of the House of the State of Utah, I have never seen such arrogance in my life. I am totally disappointed in what happened.

What will this cost of the children of Utah? One billion dollars, \$1 billion they are not going to get for education. What is this going to cost the little State of Utah, the Governor and his legislature? Six and one-half billion dollars. Tell me why? What is the reason behind this? I am really disappointed at this high-handed attitude that emanates from the White House. I surely think that the people of the West have just been written off.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET REGARDING CURRENT LEVELS OF SPENDING AND REVENUES REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPTEMBER 12, 1996 FOR FISCAL YEARS 1997-2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on the Budget and pursuant to sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, I am submitting for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an updated report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 1997 and for the 5-year period fiscal year 1997 through fiscal year 2001.

This report is to be used in applying the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution (H. Con. Res.